

F1234  
H43

## INTERVENE IN MEXICO, NOT TO MAKE BUT TO END WAR, URGES MR. HEARST

### LETTER OF MR. HEARST ON THE MEXICAN SITUATION

(Reprinted from the *Brooklyn Eagle* of July 6.)

*William Randolph Hearst, who is now a patient in the Presbyterian Hospital, recovering from a slight operation, has written the following letter to Register O'Loughlin of Brooklyn, setting forth his position in regard to our relations with Mexico:*

Presbyterian Hospital,  
Seventieth Street and Madison Avenue.  
New York, July 5, 1916.

Mr. E. T. O'Loughlin, Register of Kings County,  
Brooklyn, N. Y.

My Dear Mr. O'Loughlin:

I have noticed the attacks of the small Americans and the statement that the attitude of the Hearst newspapers on the Mexican situation is due to the fact that there are Hearst property interests in Mexico.

I have always noticed that it is those who are weak in argument who resort to abuse, and that it is those who fail with facts who resort to misrepresentation.

I do not object to attacks, even unfair ones, upon the position of the Hearst papers. I welcome them, for the more attention is given to the attitude of the Hearst papers at this time, the more glory there will be to the Hearst papers when their attitude is finally shown to be the correct one, as it surely will be.

Moreover, I know of no surer indication that a big, broad proposition is right, than is to be found in the angry opposition of little minds.

Now, by way of analysis, what is the attitude of the Hearst papers on the Mexican situation? It is merely that the United States Government exercise the fundamental function of all governments and protect its citizens; that it prevent Mexicans from murdering any more of our citizens, and that it punish Mexico for the murders and outrages already committed upon our citizens and our soldiers.

This is not an extreme attitude or an extraordinary attitude. It is not an unprecedented or unpatriotic attitude.

On the contrary, it is the usually accepted conception of the duty of any government under similar circumstances.

It is even more than that. It is a literal expression and an exact reproduction of the guarantee of the Democratic platform of 1912, under which the present Government at Washington was put into office by the American people.

A platform is a party's word of honor. It is not unreasonable, therefore, to expect and to demand that a party shall live up to its word of honor.

Second, the attitude which is maintained by the Hearst publications in reference to the Mexican situation is not unusual with them. It is the exact attitude which the Hearst publications maintained with reference to the Cuban situation, and there were no Hearst interests in Cuba.

It is the exact attitude which the Hearst publications urged upon the Government preceding the war with Spain. It is the exact attitude which the Government adopted with respect to Spain at that time.

The Hearst papers in 1898 urged the United States Government to stop, by force if need be, the years of anarchy and outrage in Cuba, to resent the insults to the United States, and to avenge the murder of American sailors and the defiant insult to the American flag in the blowing up of the Maine.

The United States Government adopted the attitude of the Hearst papers, we all know with what honor to itself, and with how great an advancement of peace and justice throughout the Western World.

Cuba was relieved from persecution and made free, and peace and happiness were established at our doors where formerly had existed everlasting disorder and destruction, suffering and sorrow.

Let those who would criticise the attitude of the Hearst papers in this Mexican situation begin by criticising the action of the United States in the Cuban situation.

Finally, in what way am I being guided by mercenary motives in my attitude on the Mexican situation? In what way am I being benefited in regard to the Hearst properties in Mexico by urging the United States to take summary action against the Government of Mexico for its crimes and outrages upon the citizens of the United States?

It would seem to me that anyone who was not an incurable idiot would see at a glance that I was incurring the greatest possible risk to any properties I or my family might have in Mexico by taking this stand, so objectionable to the powers in Mexico; and that nothing but a strong sense of patriotic duty would impel a man to take a stand so offensive to a vicious and vindictive Mexican Government when there were properties in which he was directly or indirectly interested at the mercy of that government.

There is not one man of my acquaintance who has property in Mexico who is not walking around on tiptoe and holding his breath in fear lest he should say something which would arouse the dangerous resentment at this time of the Mexican associated bandits.

I have said what I thought, freely and fearlessly, and have blazoned my opinions in the columns of my newspapers.

I have urged the United States Government to protect its weaker citizens in Mexico.

I have urged it to defend its own honor and dignity and to avenge the unwarranted insults to our flag and unprovoked murder of our soldiers.

In doing this I believe I have shown a more honorable, American independence, and a more courageous disregard of possible consequences than any of my small American critics would have dared to do.

Now, on the other hand, let us analyze the smugly selfish attitude of the typical small American.

He is for peace! Yes, for himself, without regard to the murders and outrages that are being committed and have been committed upon his brothers in Mexico.

As far as I can see, his sentiments do not differ greatly from those of the cynical Western gambler who said that he did not care what happened as long as it did not happen to him.

Of course, everybody is in favor of peace. The only question is how to secure peace.

I am for peace, actual peace, honorable peace; but, as I have said a hundred times, anarchy is not peace. Bloody murder and bestial outrage is not brotherly love and Christian goodwill.

The conditions existing in Mexico for four years have been not peace, but war, and worse than war.

Intervention in Mexico is not for the purpose of making war. It is for the purpose of ending war.

Indifference to the awful conditions prevailing in Mexico has not ended them. It has aggravated them.

I have no patience with the superior attitude of the small American who prides himself on his Christian resignation to the sufferings of other people, and

who congratulates himself on his Christian endurance of the afflictions of his brethren.

You know Christ did not say, "If a man smite thy brother on one cheek, turn thou thy brother's other cheek to be smitten." Nor did Christ say, "If a man take away thy brother's coat give him thy brother's cloak also." Nor yet did he say, "If a man murder and maltreat thy brother give him also thy sister to be maltreated and murdered."

Yet, your small American takes vast Christian credit to himself, for being willing to allow destruction, devastation, disaster and death to proceed peacefully without any warlike interference from him.

Imagine a man lying lazily on his back on the beach expectantly watching his brother drown, although fully able to save him, and then coming home and hiring a page in a newspaper to confess his indolence and indifference and proudly to proclaim his lack of human sympathy and manly quality.

Imagine a policeman, a guardian of the peace with a public duty to perform, watching men being murdered and women and children being brutally debased and abused by ruffians, and then giving a dinner and reading a little written piece to exalt his flagrant neglect of duty as Christian forbearance and to extol his skulking cowardice as a noble effort to preserve the peace.

Naturally, to such policies I prefer, and will continue to prosecute, my own policy of urging Uncle Sam courageously to do his full duty to his citizens, to his soldiers and to himself, and to arrest Mexico for high crimes against humanity and civilization.

For four years we have tried by a policy of neglect of duty to secure peace in Mexico, and the situation there is worse today than it has been at any time in the past.

Since the policy of neglect of duty has so utterly failed to secure peace and justice, let us try the policy of active performance of duty which has so frequently and so signally succeeded in the glorious history of this Republic.

Faithfully yours,

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST.

## OPEN LETTER OF MR. M. C. ROLLAND TO MR. W. R. HEARST

DEAR SIR:

So far you have never been refuted by a Mexican.

I think this is the first time, and in justice to the sincerity with which I now appeal to you, and for the good of the public, I trust you will publish this letter in your newspapers, even as I purpose to give it publicity through other channels.

You have, Mr. Hearst, cruelly attacked Mexico; you have roused great hatred and distributed so much venom, piling up such a mass of falsehood concerning our people, that even the most isolated Indian of our country is aware of the existence of a Mr. Hearst who owns many newspapers; knows that he is constantly maligned by that gentleman; and that the major part of that person's statements is false—which, when said even by a humble Indian, is a very delicate matter for a self-respecting journalist.

Well, Mr. Hearst, we Mexicans, after observing your conduct, and studying your policy of constant intervention and continued threats against our liberties, and taking into consideration your respectable station in life, cannot help thinking that you have acted consistently on information disgracefully incomplete and many times misleading.

We cannot believe it otherwise, as it would seem impossible that you would in good faith wish to crush us when we have never harmed you, and when we have every right to live and develop in the same manner as other nations of the world have done.

You have always been misinformed. You were in the wrong when you encouraged Porfirio Diaz' policy, because you were told that his government was an ideal one; and subsequently, I am sure, you found out that such dictatorship



was nothing but the crassest manifestation of feudalism, rooted in slavery of the peons, the yoke of the landowner, and the political power of the Catholic Clergy.

You were later informed that Huerta was a great man, and you were against the Revolution, whose avowed programme was the revindication of all outraged human rights.

You were afterwards told that Villa also was a great man, and in 1914, above your own signature, you began a campaign to raise this bandit to the Presidency of Mexico.

You must be fully aware now that you were misinformed, for Villa was only the instrument of the sinister interests which the Revolution was combating.

You have continued to fight the Revolution, guided constantly no doubt by false information, and in the last letter which you wrote after your illness (which we regret very much), you explained that if you have attacked Mexico it is because it should be castigated, and that you were doing it through motives of patriotism, since nobody is ignorant of the fact that in the event of war, your properties in Mexico would be endangered.

It seems that in this last letter of yours you try to give to the public a vindication of your whole course of action; and for this reason I take great pleasure in improving this opportunity to point out to you that even in this final argument which you set up as a defense, you are mistaken, because the information which you have unfortunately received is completely erroneous.

The properties which you own are mainly stationary, which do not suffer greatly in case of war. Your large estates in Chihuahua and Tabasco would lose absolutely nothing through the ravages of war. On the other hand, with the triumph of the Revolution, you are certainly going to see yourself in difficulties in order to keep up these great estates which you have acquired very cheaply, and which (this you certainly must know) you have maintained without paying taxes, as all other great landowners of Mexico have had to do, thus allowing the responsibility of looking after the said properties to fall upon the nation, and the burden of all administrative expenditures upon the few small landowners who may still exist.

Furthermore, should the United States annex the State of Chihuahua, for example (which we Mexicans would look upon in the same light as you would the invasion of New England by the Germans) automatically your ranch would cost from four to five times more, it would be more easily negotiable because it would have the guaranty of millions of your compatriots who have made this country rich and prosperous, and in such case you would pay a less amount in taxes than what the Revolution would have to impose on you in all justice.

This is the simple truth. However, as your work is so violent, so blind, and so utterly without quarter against a people which is after all only fighting to establish its well-being—a phenomenon which you, as a cultured man, cannot deny is entirely legitimate—we cannot, I repeat, reach any other conclusion than that you are ill-informed. Hence, we may trust that once you come to recognize the truth, the justice, of our cause, and the wave of hatred which your conduct has roused in us against the whole American people—who, in point of fact, do not demand what you yourself are clamoring for—then, you will place yourself on the side of justice, and finally admit that your properties in Mexico must be subject to the laws of the country. By so doing, you will finally furnish that genuine proof of disinterestedness which you now claim to be ready to give, and you will put an end to the rise of baser passions and false mouthings of patriotism with which the public in general has reason to believe you are trying to lead your fellow-citizens astray.

I am, Sir, very sincerely,

M. C. ROLLAND.

New York, July 1916.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 015 833 462 8